

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of:

Hongtei E. Tseng

Group Art Unit: 3683

Serial Number: 10/708,680

Examiner: Graham, Matthew C.


Filed: 03/18/2004

For: METHOD AND APPARATUS TO ENHANCE BRAKE-STEER OF A VEHICLE USING A  
CONTROLLABLE SUSPENSION COMPONENT

Attorney Docket No: 81095830 (FGT 1912 PA)

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being filed electronically through EFS-Web of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

  
Signature

Date: 1-10-2007

DONNA KRAFT

**APPELLANTS' REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answer dated November 20, 2006, and having a shortened statutory period for response running to and including January 20, 2007, Appellants respond as follows:


**REMARKS**

In the “Response to Argument” section of the Examiner’s Answer, the Examiner states that “Appellants admit the Fukushima suspension appears to be moved in a vertical direction can read as articulating at least one wheel (sic).” The Examiner cites paragraph 0102 of Appellants’ specification, wherein it is stated that normal load at a selective wheel or wheels might be adjusted through suspension control or suspension modification and that this may be combined with brake-steer to reduce the turning radius of the vehicle more than would otherwise be possible with brake-steer alone. Appellants dispute that this passage equates increasing normal force with articulation of a wheel. In this respect the Examiner’s attention is directed to paragraph 0105 of Appellants’ specification, wherein articulation is described as arising, from a compliant component of a Hotchkiss suspension or from an adjustable toe link in an independent suspension. Appellants respectfully submit that their steadfast contention that neither Fukushima nor Wessman, whether taken singly, or in combination with each other, either teach or suggest the invention of Claim 1, remains correct, if for no other reason than the impropriety of the Examiner’s assertion that jounce and rebound (i.e. vertical) movement is ‘articulation’.

Regarding Claim 17, the Examiner states that “Appellants failed to argue the underscored combination” of Wessman and Fukushima. Appellants’ Brief states explicitly that neither Fukushima nor Wessman either teach or suggest a suspension control to reduce the turning radius of the vehicle in response to brake-steer, and it is inherent that because both Fukushima and Wessman are bereft of any hint of this detail, their combination could not include it either. As a result, Appellants reassert their previous response to the rejection of Claim 17. Moreover, the Examiner has made the same sort of observation with respect to Claims 13 and 24, Claims 14, 25 and 26, and Claims 16 and 28, and Appellants hereby reassert that because the applied references are bereft of any teaching or suggestion upon which a colorable rejection could be posited, the appealed claims are allowable over these rejections.

Regarding Claims 3 and 23, the Examiner states that Ritz teaches applying brake-steer in the form of increased drive torque. However, there is no controlling of a suspension component taught by Ritz, and Claims 3 and 23 are allowable over the Examiner’s rejection. Finally, regarding Claims 10 and 22, the Examiner has cited no teaching of Wessman or Krueger which detects a parking mode. As a result, Claims 10 and 22 are allowable over the Examiner’s rejection.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Jerome R. Drouillard  
Registration No. 28,008  
Attorney for Appellants

Date: 1/10/02  
Artz & Artz, P.C.  
28333 Telegraph Road  
Suite 250  
Southfield, MI 48034  
(248) 223-9500